



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/905,540	07/13/2001	Michael Dean McCutchan	8169M	3927

27752 7590 12/05/2002

THE PROCTER & GAMBLE COMPANY  
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DIVISION  
WINTON HILL TECHNICAL CENTER - BOX 161  
6110 CENTER HILL AVENUE  
CINCINNATI, OH 45224

EXAMINER

BECKER, DREW E

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1761

DATE MAILED: 12/05/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Applicati n N .	Applicant(s)	
	09/905,540	MCCUTCHAN, MICHAEL DEAN	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Drew E Becker	1761	

-- The MAILING DATE f this c mmunication app ars on the cover she t with the correspondence address --

**Peri d for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 October 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

**Pri rity under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                                | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____  |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                       | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) <u>4</u> | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other:  |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Information Disclosure Statement***

1. The information disclosure statement filed October 10, 2001 fails to comply with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97, 1.98 and MPEP § 609 because the Non Patent Literature references do not disclose a publication date. Applicant's attorney could not provide dates for these references when called on November 25, 2002. In order to speed along prosecution, it will be assumed that the publication dates of these references were sometime before the filing date of this application since they are described in the specification. This would equate to 102(a) or 102(b) publication dates. In order to speed prosecution, both rejections will be made.

### ***Specification***

2. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: page 1, line 6 includes the docket number of the application, which is unnecessary.

Appropriate correction is required.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a or b) as being anticipated by Snack-a-Dip.

Snack-a-Dip teaches a kit comprising a canister containing a plurality of snack pieces, one of the snack pieces having a projected area of about  $1330 \text{ mm}^2$ , an attached tub containing a dip condiment, and the kit having a space efficiency of about  $0.126 \text{ g/cm}^3$ .

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 2-3 and 17-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Snack-a-Dip in view of Yan Yan Snacks Meiji.

Snack-a-Dip teaches the above mentioned components as well as the canister having a sidewall, bottom wall, and top opening; a snack piece to dip ratio of 1.5; and a removable lid. Snack-a-Dip does not disclose a space efficiency greater than 0.20. Yan Yan Snacks Meiji teaches a kit comprising a canister containing snack pieces, a tub containing dip condiment, and a space efficiency of 0.228 (page 6, Table 1 of applicants' specification). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the space efficiency of Yan Yan into the kit of Snack-a-Dip since both were directed to kits containing snack pieces and dip condiments, since it was commonly known to decrease shipping costs by packing goods together with less unused air

Art Unit: 1761

space, and since space efficiencies of 0.228 were commonly known and used for food kits as shown by Yan Yan.

7. Claims 7-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Snack-a-Dip in view of Bezek et al [Pat. No. 6,472,007].

Snack-a-Dip teaches the above mentioned concepts as well as an edge-to-edge linear dimension of 59 mm. Snack-a-Dip does not disclose snack pieces in a nested arrangement. Bezek et al teaches a kit comprising a canister with stacked tortilla chips (column 7, line 16). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the stacked chips of Bezek et al into the kit of Snack-a-Dip since both are directed to chip containers, since Snack-a-Dip already included tortilla chips, and since stacking the chips, as done by Bezek et al, would have provided a higher space efficiency as well as helping to prevent the chips from being broken during transport.

8. Claims 5 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Snack-a-Dip, in view of Yan Yan Snacks Meiji, as applied above, and further in view of Bezek et al.

Snack-a-Dip and Yan Yan Snacks Meiji teach the above mentioned components.

Snack-a-Dip and Yan Yan do not teach a triangular shape or stacked chips. Bezek et al also teaches a kit comprising a triangular canister containing stacked chips (column 7, line 15). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the triangular shape of Bezek et al into the kit of Snack-a-Dip since both are directed to chip containers, since Snack-a-Dip already included triangular tortilla chips, and since triangular shaped canisters were commonly used for chip containers as shown by

Art Unit: 1761

Bezek et al (column 7, line 16). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the stacked chips of Bezek et al into the kit of Snack-a-Dip since both are directed to chip containers, since Snack-a-Dip already included tortilla chips, and since stacking the chips, as done by Bezek et al, would have provided a higher space efficiency as well as helping to prevent the chips from being broken during transport.

9. Claims 13-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Snack-a-Dip, in view of Bezek et al, as applied to claim 12 above, and further in view of Yan Yan.

Snack-a-Dip and Bezek et al teach the above mentioned components. Bezek et al also teaches nested chips (column 7, line 15). Snack-a-Dip and Bezek et al do not teach a space efficiency greater than 0.2. Yan Yan Snacks Meiji teaches a kit comprising a canister containing snack pieces, a tub containing dip condiment, and a space efficiency of 0.228 (page 6, Table 1 of applicants' specification). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the space efficiency of Yan Yan into the kit of Snack-a-Dip since both were directed to kits containing snack pieces and dip condiments, since it was commonly known to decrease shipping costs by packing goods together with less unused air space, and since space efficiencies of 0.228 were commonly known and used for food kits as shown by Yan Yan.

10. Claims 4 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Snack-a-Dip, in view of Yan Yan, as applied to claim 2 above, and further in view of Tostitos Chips & Salsa.

Art Unit: 1761

Snack-a-Dip and Yan Yan teach the above mentioned components. Snack-a-Dip and Yan Yan do not teach a snack piece area of greater than 1500 mm<sup>2</sup>. Tostitos Chips & Salsa teach kit comprising snack pieces and condiments wherein the snack piece area is 1590 mm<sup>2</sup> (page 6, Table 1 of applicants' specification). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the snack piece size of Tostitos Chips & Salsa into the kit of Snack-a-Dip since both are directed to kits for snack pieces and dip, since Snack-a-Dip already included tortilla chips, and since tortilla chips were commonly made with an area of 1590 mm<sup>2</sup> as shown by Tostitos Chips & Salsa.

11. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Sagel et al [Des. 439,838], DE 29910029U1, McCutchan [Des. 445,689], Grenell [Pat. No. 4,444,324], Stump [Pat. No. 3,385,503], Turpin [Pat. No. 3,962,476], WO 02/06133A1, Rose [Pat. No. 2,076,132], Hanson [Pat. No. 6,021,903], Blow Jr et al [Pat. No. 4,054,205], US 2002/0122852A1, and Lane Jr [Pat. No. 4,854,466] teach food and condiment kits.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Drew E Becker whose telephone number is 703-305-0300. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday 7am-5pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Milton Cano can be reached on 703-308-3959. The fax phone numbers for

Art Unit: 1761

the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-872-9310 for regular communications and 703-872-9311 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-1495.

Drew E Becker  
Examiner  
Art Unit 1761

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Drew Becker", followed by a long horizontal flourish.

November 27, 2002